

REMARKS

Claims 1 through 12, 14 through 19, 21 through 23, 26 through 28, 31 through 34, 37 through 39, 41, 42, 44, 45, and 47 through 78 are currently pending in the application. Claims 13, 20, 24, 25, 29, 30, 35, 36, 40, 43, and 46 have been canceled. This amendment is in response to the Final Office Action of August 17, 2001.

Please note that the Assignee of the present invention is filing with this amendment a POWER OF ATTORNEY (37 C.F.R. § 1.34(a)), REVOCATION OF PRIOR POWER OF ATTORNEY (37 C.F.R. § 1.36) and REQUEST TO CHANGE CORRESPONDENCE ADDRESS (37 C.F.R. § 1.33(d)) with STATEMENT PURSUANT TO 37 C.F.R. § 3.73.

Applicant notes that a Form PTO-892 was included with the outstanding Office Action, and further notes that a copy of the Non-Patent Document, "Laplante, Phillip A. Ed., Comprehensive Dictionary of Electrical Engineering," should have been included therewith. Applicant did not receive a copy of the document, but would appreciate receiving a copy with the next Office Action.

Claims 47, 48, and 65 were objected to due to informalities in the claim language. Appropriate changes to the claim dependencies have been made.

Claim 21 has been amended to use consistent terminology in the claim.

Claims 1 through 7, 9 through 12, 14 through 19, 21 through 23, 26 through 28, 31 through 34, 39, 41, 42, 44, 45, 56 through 60, 62 through 67, 69 through 75, 77, and 78 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Burns et al. (U.S. Patent 6,048,269).

Claims 37, 38, 40, 43, and 47 through 55 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Burns et al. (U.S. Patent 6,048,269).

Claims 8, 61, 68, and 76 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Burns et al. (U.S. Patent 6,048,269) in view of Kelly et al. (U.S. Patent 5,816,918).

After carefully considering the cited prior art, the rejections, and the Examiner's comments, Applicant submits that the claimed invention is clearly distinguished over the cited prior art.

Applicant submits that a claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference. *Verdegaal Brothers v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the claim. *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 9 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989).

Applicant further submits that to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness under 35 U.S.C. § 103 three basic criteria must be met. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Third, the cited prior art reference must teach or suggest all of the claim limitations. Furthermore, the suggestion to make the claimed combination and the reasonable expectation of success must both be found in the prior art, and not based on Applicant's disclosure.

Turning to the cited prior art, the Burns et al. reference is directed to a gaming apparatus which comprises a slot machine capable of accepting either paper currency, preprinted coupons, or cash out slips. The slot machine also includes a printer that prints and dispenses cash out slips which include a bar code representing a unique identification that provides the amount of winnings. The cash out slips can be scanned into a separate currency dispenser at a Cashier's Station for receiving currency. The individual cash out slips each have a unique random number printed thereon to help prevent counterfeiting of the slips. The cash out slips also include a bar code printed thereon, the bar code representing the monetary value of the value of the credit stored in the particular slot machine. When the cash out slip is read, a bar code reader transmits a signal to a CPU connected to the reader that compares the bard code on the particular cash out ticket with those stored in its memory, the memory containing the value of the cash out slip, the unique identification random generated number, and its status as being paid, etc. Nowhere in the Burns et al. reference is there any disclosure whatsoever regarding the printing of a bar code on a cash out slip where the bar code printed on the cash out slip represents an address in a CPU.

Applicant submits that the Burns et al. reference does not anticipate the presently claimed invention of claims 1 through 7, 9 through 12, 14 through 19, 21 through 23, 26 through 28, 31 through 34, 39, 41, 42, 44, 45, 56 through 60, 62 through 67, 69 through 75, 77, and 78 under 35 U.S.C. § 102 because the Burns et al. reference does not, either expressly or inherently, describe each and every element of the invention as set forth in the claim describing the identical invention in as complete detail as is contained in the claim.

For instance, Applicant submits that the Burns et al. reference does not describe such elements of the claimed invention in the identical detail calling for “a permanent coded media having encoded thereon only a unique identifier, said identifier corresponding to said unique address in said central processing system memory”, “a gaming coupon having encoded thereon only a unique identifier, said identifier corresponding to said unique address in said central processing system memory”, “said change machine input accepts currency, transmits a signal representing value represented by said currency and returns said gaming coupons having encoded thereon said unique address”, “wherein said change machine . . . returns said gaming coupons having encoded thereon said unique identifier”, “a gaming coupon having encoded thereon only a unique identifier . . . corresponding to said unique address in said central processing system memory”, “accessing credit data stored in a memory location corresponding to said unique memory identifier”, accessing credit data stored in a memory location corresponding to said unique memory identifier”, “generating a gaming coupon having only said unique address encoded thereon as a unique identifier”, “an input for accepting a permanent coded media having encoded thereon only a unique identifier”, “an input for accepting a permanent coded media having encoded thereon only a unique identifier”, and “an input for accepting a permanent coded media having encoded thereon only a unique identifier”.

Applicant submits that the Burns et al. reference does not expressly or inherently describe such elements of the claimed invention whatsoever to anticipate the claimed invention under 35 U.S.C. § 102. Accordingly, independent claims 1, 14, 21, 26, 31, 39, 42, 45, 56, 63, and 71 as well as all dependent claims therefrom are allowable.

Turning to the rejection of independent claims 37, 49, 52, and 53 as being unpatentable over the Burns et al. reference under 35 U.S.C. § 103, Applicant submits that the Burns et al. reference does not establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness because there is no suggestion or motivation to modify the Burns et al. reference, the cited prior art does not teach or suggest all the limitations of the claimed invention, and any rejection of the claimed invention based upon the Burns et al. reference is a hindsight reconstruction of the claimed invention based solely upon the Applicant's disclosure, not the cited prior art.

First, Applicant submits that there is no suggestion whatsoever in the Burns et al. reference for any modification thereof to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness under 35 U.S.C. § 103 for the memory addresses to be used rather than or in the place of the random generated numbers for the coupons or the deletion of information from the coupons. Solely Applicant's disclosure contains any information regarding such assertions or suggestions for modification, not the Burns et al. reference or the general knowledge.

Therefore, the Burns et al. reference does not establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness under 35 U.S.C. § 103 regarding the claimed invention. Accordingly, independent claims 37, 49, 52, and 53 as well as the dependent claims therefrom are allowable.

Second, Applicant submits that the Burns et al. reference does not teach or suggest all the limitations of the claimed invention to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness under 35 U.S.C. § 103. Applicant submits that the Burns et al. reference fails to teach or suggest such claim limitations calling for "generating a gaming coupon having only said unique address encoded thereon as a unique identifier", "generating a gaming coupon having only said unique address encoded thereon as a unique identifier", "generating a second coded media having only said unique address encoded thereon as a unique identifier", and "generating a second said gaming coupon having only said unique address encoded thereon as a unique identifier". Applicant submits that the Burns et al. reference neither teaches or suggests such claim limitations whatsoever.

Therefore, the Burns et al. reference does not establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness under 35 U.S.C. § 103 regarding the claimed invention. Accordingly, independent claims 37, 49, 52, and 53 as well as the dependent claims therefrom are allowable.

Finally, Applicant submits that any rejection of the claimed invention based upon the Burns et al. reference under 35 U.S.C. § 103 is a hindsight reconstruction of the claimed invention based solely upon the Applicant's disclosure because the cited prior art does not teach or suggest the claimed invention whatsoever. As the cited prior art does not teach, or suggest the limitations of the claimed invention, the sole basis for any rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103 can only be Applicant's disclosure. Any such rejection is neither within the ambit nor the purview of 35 U.S.C. § 103 and, clearly, improper.

Therefore, the Burns et al. reference does not and cannot establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness under 35 U.S.C. § 103 regarding the claimed invention. Accordingly, independent claims 37, 49, 52, and 53 as well as the dependent claims therefrom are allowable.

Applicant submits that since claims 8, 61, 68, and 76 depend from allowable independent claims, no discussion of the rejection of such claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103 based upon the combination of the Burns et al. reference in view of the Kelly et al. reference is necessary as the Kelly et al. reference does not describe, teach, or suggest either the elements or limitations of the claimed invention discussed herein.

Applicant requests entry of this amendment for the following reasons:

The amendment is timely filed.

The amendment clearly places the application in condition for allowance.

The amendment does not require any further search or consideration as the only amendments to the claims are to correct informalities and for consistent usage of terms in the same claim.

The amendment reduces the number of issues for any subsequent appeal of the Final Rejection.

In summary, Applicant submits that claims 1 through 12, 14 through 19, 21 through 23, 26 through 28, 31 through 34, 37 through 39, 41, 42, 44, 45, and 47 through 78 are clearly allowable over the cited prior art.

Applicant requests the entry of this amendment, the allowance of claims 1 through 12, 14 through 19, 21 through 23, 26 through 28, 31 through 34, 37 through 39, 41, 42, 44, 45, and 47 through 78, and the case passed for issue.

Respectfully submitted,



James R. Duzan
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 28,393
TRASKBRITT, PC
P.O. Box 2550
Salt Lake City, Utah 84110
(801) 532-1922

Date: November 16, 2001
JRD/ps:djp

Enclosure: Version with Markings to Show Changes Made

N:\27275143\Amendment Final.wpd

APPENDIX A

VERSION WITH MARKINGS TO SHOW CHANGES MADE

IN THE CLAIMS:

A marked-up version of each of the presently amended claims, highlighting the changes thereto, follows:

21. (Amended) A gaming system for implementing a coinless gaming environment, said gaming system comprising:

a central processing system, said central processing system including a memory having a plurality of memory locations identified by a unique address for storing value;

a plurality of gaming machines; and

a plurality of change machines, said change machines having an input for accepting currency and for accepting gaming coupons, and an output for distributing said gaming coupons and for distributing currency;

wherein said change machine input accepts currency, transmits a signal representing value represented by said currency and returns said gaming coupons having encoded thereon said unique address [identifier]; and

wherein said change machine input accepts said gaming coupons, reads said unique identifier and transmits a signal representing said unique identifier to said central processing system.

47. (Amended) The method for implementing a coinless gaming environment as recited in claim 45 [46], wherein said gaming coupon encoding is printing a bar code on said gaming coupon.

65. (Amended) The gaming machine as recited in claim 63 [65], wherein said encoding is a bar code.